

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed November 23, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1 through 56 under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting; the Applicant submits herewith a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c). The Examiner objected to claims 1 and 26 because of informalities; specifically, that they failed to end with a period. Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 13-38, and 41-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,610,972 (issued Mar. 11, 1997; hereinafter “Emery”). The Examiner also rejected claims 11, 12, 39, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emery in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,721,825 (issued Feb. 24, 1998; hereinafter “Lawson”).

Objections

The Applicant has amended claims 1 and 29 to correct informalities. In the Examiner's objection, the Examiner pointed to claims 1 and 26 as failing to end with a period. Claim 26 appeared to correctly end with a period. However, claim 29 did fail to end with a period and the Applicant has amended the claim to correct the informality.

Rejections

Claims 1 through 28

In the office action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by Emery. The Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 2 for editorial clarity and to better protect the invention; claim 2 has, thus, been canceled. Dependent claim 15 has also been amended to correct a typographical error. Accordingly, claim 1 now recites a system for providing integrated control of at least one communication service provided by at

least one communication service provider comprising at least one integrated services controller ("ISC") in which the ISC is further configured to provide centralized prioritized processing for the one or more messages exchanged with the other system entities through use of intelligent prioritization rules.

Emery appears to disclose a PCS system using wireline/wireless integration using central service controllers (referred to as ISCPs). The Examiner states that "Emery discloses that at least one ISC is further configured to provide centralized prioritized processing for the one or more messages exchanged with the other system entities through use of intelligent prioritization rules (column 18, lines 27-30)." The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Emery does not teach an ISC that provides centralized prioritized processing for the one or more messages exchanged with the other system entities through use of intelligent prioritization rules.

In the passage in column 18 referenced by the Examiner, Emery discloses a PCS handset registration process. This prioritized registration process allows the mobile PCS handset to register with a PCS microcell controller as opposed to a cellular mobile controller in the same area. In other words, the prioritized registration process that Emery teaches is related to registration for mobility controllers, not the processing of an ISC. Accordingly, Emery does not teach that which the applicant claims.

Again, the Applicant claims an ISC that is further configured to provide centralized prioritized processing for one or more messages exchanged with the other system entities through use of intelligent prioritization rules. The Applicant maintains that Emery does not teach such centralized prioritized processing by the ISC. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 1. Additionally, claims 3 through 28 depend from independent claim 1 and include all of the novel and nonobvious features of the independent

claim. For at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 3 through 28.

Claims 29 through 56

In the office action, Examiner rejected claim 29 as being anticipated by Emery. The Applicant has amended claim 29 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 30 for editorial clarity and to better protect the invention; the Applicant has canceled claim 30. Dependent claims 43 and 50 have also been amended to correct typographical errors. Accordingly, claim 29 now recites a method for providing integrated control of at least one communication service provided by at least one communication service provider comprising a step of configuring at least one ISC to establish a connection with a plurality of communication networks to communicate control messages with system entities. At least one ISC is further configured to provide centralized prioritized processing for the messages exchanged with the other system entities through the use of intelligent prioritization rules.

In the Examiner's rejection of claim 29, the Examiner provided the same reasons for the rejection recited in the rejection of claim 1. Since the incorporated limitation of canceled claim 30 is nearly identical to the limitation incorporated into claim 1, the arguments that were made with respect to claim 1 apply here as well. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 29. Additionally, claims 31 through 56 depend from independent claim 29 and include all of the novel and nonobvious features of the independent claim. For at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 31 through 56.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, the Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 

Robert G. Crouch

Registration No. 34,806

3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411

Aurora, Colorado 80014

(303) 338-0997

Date: February 23, 2005